

## REMARKS

In this amendment, claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 15 and 16 are canceled. In addition, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 17-19 are amended and claims 20 and 21 are added. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-6 and 11-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0176071, hereinafter “Gehrmann” and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0272466, hereinafter “Haverinen”. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for managing a local Terminal Equipment (TE) accessing a network, wherein a management list of a local TE allowed to access contains an identity and current state information of the local TE allowed to access, is wherein the management list is configured in a Mobile Terminal (MT) and a user identity card is inserted in the MT, the method comprising:

when the network allows only a limited number of TEs to access the network via the MT, after receiving an authentication request identity message containing the identity of the local TE from the local TE, the MT deciding according to the current state information of the local TE allowed to access whether the MT is serving the number of TEs as limited by the network;

if the MT is serving the number of TEs as limited by the network, refusing to return the identity of the user identity card to the TE, and terminating the procedure;

if the MT is not serving the number of TEs as limited by the network, the MT deciding whether the identity in the received authentication request identity message exists in the management list of a local TE allowed to access;

if the identity exists in the management list of the local TE allowed to access, the MT acquiring an identity of the user identity card and returning the identity to the TE, so that the TE accesses the network by using this identity;

**if a message of successful authentication is received from the TE, the MT modifying the current state information of the TE in the management list of a local TE allowed to access, making the information indicate an online state, sending key information to the TE, so that the TE accessing the**

**network by using the received key information**

In the Examiner's Office Action mailed April 2, 2010, the limitations of claim 7 are not found in the prior art of record. At least, the features that "if a message of successful authentication is received from the TE, the MT modifying the current state information of the TE in the management list of a local TE allowed to access, making the information indicate an online state, sending key information to the TE, so that the TE accessing the network by using the received key information" in the claim 1 are not found in the prior art record.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any combination of AAPA, Gehrmann and Haverinen for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the additional limitations.

Independent claim 14, as amended, recites:

A method for managing a local TE accessing a network, with a user identity card inserted in a MT, the method comprising:

receiving an authentication request identity message from the local TE, the MT requiring the identity of the user from the identity card, sending the identity to the TE, so that **the TE performs authentication with the network by using the identity;**

**after receiving a authentication response message forwarding by the TE from the network;**

**if the authentication response message is a message of successful authentication, the MT sending key information to the TE, so that the TE accesses the network using the received key information; otherwise, terminating the procedure.**

Applicant respectfully submits that Gehrman does not disclose that “the MT requiring the identity of the user from the identity card, sending the identity to the TE, so that **the TE performs authentication with the network by using the identity; after receiving a authentication response message forwarding by the TE from the network; if the authentication response message is a message of successful authentication, the MT sending key information to the TE, so that the TE accesses the network using the received key information**”. (emphasis added)

Gehrman discloses a method of granting a client communication terminal access to a subscription module of a server communication terminal.

Gehrman states that “in many wireless systems, communications terminals are equipped with a subscription module” (Paragraph 2, lines 1-3) and that “in the context of GSM, subscription is based on a SIM (subscriber identity module) card, i.e., the subscription module is implemented as a SIM card attached to a mobile terminal” (Paragraph 4, lines 1-4). In addition, Gehrman recites that “the client communication terminal will also be referred to as the RAA Client” (Paragraph 51, lines 11-12). The subscription module of Gehrman is analogous to the user identity card inserted in the MT of claim 14. Furthermore, the RAA Client or the subscription module of Gehrman is analogous to the TE of claim 14. Figures 4-6 of Gehrman refer to the **authentication procedure between the client communication terminal and the subscription module**. Gehrman also states that “**one particular shared secret is used to secure the communication with one particular RAA client or a subscription module.**” That is to say, a shared key is exchanged between the client communication terminal and the subscription module. But claim 14 recites that “**the TE performs authentication with the network by using the identity**” and that “**after receiving a authentication response message**

**forwarding by the TE from the network; if the authentication response message is a message of successful authentication, the MT sending key information to the TE, so that the TE accesses the network using the received key information.”** Therefore, Gehrman dose not disclose these features.

In addition, AAPA states that “the process of the network side sending the authentication result to the TE occurs **at the same time** of the MT sending the information of key(s) to the TE without a binding mechanism between the two processes, which causes a waste of the network resources.” (Paragraph 25, lines 1-6) But claim 14 recites that “**after** receiving a authentication response message forwarding by the TE from the network; if the authentication response message is a message of successful authentication, the MT sending key information to the TE”. So AAPA does not disclose these features either.

Furthermore, Haverinen only discloses a split UE security function. But Haverinen does not disclose these features above.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 patentably distinguishes over any combination of AAPA, Gehrman and Haverinen for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 17 depends from claim 14 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the additional limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been

properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ira S. Matsil  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,272

---

Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Ste. 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218